Prepared for submission to JCAP

Model-independent limits and constraints on extended theories of gravity from cosmic reconstruction techniques

Álvaro de la Cruz-Dombriz[a,b] **Peter K. S. Dunsby**[a,b,c] **Orlando Luongo**[a,b,d,e] **Lorenzo Reverberi**[a,b]

[a]Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South Africa.
[b]Astrophysics, Cosmology and Gravity Centre (ACGC), University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South Africa.
[c]South African Astronomical Observatory, Observatory 7925, Cape Town, South Africa
[d]Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Napoli "Federico II", Via Cinthia, I-80126, Napoli, Italy.
[e]Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare (INFN), Via Cinthia, I-80126, Napoli, Italy.

E-mail: alvaro.delacruzdombriz@uct.ac.za, peter.dunsby@uct.ac.za, luongo@na.infn.it, lorenzo.reverberi@uct.ac.za

arXiv:1608.03746v2 [gr-qc] 18 Dec 2016

Abstract. The onset of dark energy domination depends on the particular gravitational theory driving the cosmic evolution. Model independent techniques are crucial to test the both the present ΛCDM cosmological paradigm and alternative theories, making the least possible number of assumptions about the Universe. In this paper we investigate whether cosmography is able to distinguish between different gravitational theories, by determining bounds on model parameters for three different extensions of General Relativity, namely quintessence, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ gravitational theories. We expand each class of theories in powers of redshift z around the present time, making no additional assumptions. This procedure is an extension of previous work and can be seen as the most general approach for testing extended theories of gravity through the use of cosmography. In the case of $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories, we show that some assumptions on model parameters often made in previous works are superfluous or even unjustified.

We use data from the Union 2.1 supernovae catalogue, baryonic acoustic oscillation data and $H(z)$ differential age compilations, which probe cosmology on different scales of the cosmological evolution. We perform a Monte Carlo analysis using a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm with a Gelman-Rubin convergence criterion, reporting 1–σ and 2–σ confidence levels. To do so, we perform two distinct fits, assuming only data within $z < 1$ first and then without limitations in redshift. We obtain the corresponding numerical intervals in which coefficients span, and find that the data is compatible the ΛCDM limit of all three theories at the 1-σ level, while still compatible with quite a large portion of parameter space. We compare our results to the truncated ΛCDM paradigm, demonstrating that our bounds divert from the expectations of previous works, showing that the permitted regions of coefficients are significantly modified and in general widened with respect to values usually reported in the existing literature. Finally, we test the extended theories through the Bayesian selection criteria AIC and BIC.

ArXiv ePrint: 1608.03746

Contents

1 Introduction **1**

2 Cosmographic approach in extended theories **3**
2.1 Basics of Cosmography 3
2.2 Cosmography Beyond the Standard Cosmological Model 4
2.3 Problems and Shortcomings of Cosmography 5

3 Constraining Alternative Theories with Cosmography **5**
3.1 Quintessence Theories 5
3.2 $F(\mathcal{T})$ Theories 6
3.3 $f(R)$ Theories 8

4 Datasets **9**
4.1 Type Ia Supernovae 9
4.2 The Hubble Rate compilation 10
4.3 Baryon Acoustic Oscillations 10

5 Numerical results **11**
5.1 Fitting Procedure 11
5.2 Exact vs. Truncated ΛCDM 12
5.3 Quintessence Theories 13
5.4 $F(\mathcal{T})$ Theories 14
5.5 $f(R)$ Theories 15
5.6 Model Selection Criteria 15
5.7 Comparison with Previous Work 17

6 Conclusions **19**

1 Introduction

One of the most important challenges in modern cosmology is to determine whether the theory of General Relativity (GR) is the best gravitational theory able to describe the dynamics of the Universe on all scales. In particular, since the discovery of the cosmic acceleration [1–5] and in view of recent developments related to the discovery of gravitational waves [6], determining a completely self-consistent description of the gravitational action has become even more essential [7]. Indeed, on the one hand observations of supernovae suggest that our Universe is currently speeding up, while on the other hand structure formation constraints and causal requirements on the cosmic angular distribution suggest the presence of three unknown ingredients, namely dark energy, dark matter and the inflaton field [8]. Thus, in lieu of invoking new ingredients in Einstein's equations, extensions of GR turn out to be a very natural landscape to investigate where Einstein's gravity might break down [9]. Furthermore, some extended theories of gravity have the advantage of being able to describe both the current cosmic evolution and the whole expansion history of the Universe at higher energy scales [10].

However, the main disadvantages of any modification of Einstein's gravity relate to the physical motivation of these theories and any instabilities that emerge as a result of introducing extra terms. In particular, among all plausible modifications, several approaches successfully reproduce the cosmic evolution with the same accuracy as the Concordance cosmological ΛCDM model, leading to a degeneracy problem [11–14]. A possible way of alleviating such a degeneracy is to combine different measurements with the aim of reducing the phase space of free parameters. Nevertheless, the caveat

of any measurement is that one is often forced to assume the statistical validity of a given cosmological model a priori. In such a way, measures and error propagation lead to the particular framework under examination, without being conclusive in selecting models. For those reasons, amongst several statistical treatments, the class of model-independent techniques becomes essential to guarantee that the statistical outcomes do not depend upon the choice of the model itself. Research of the so-called *cosmography* of the Universe belongs to this class and has drawn much attention in recent years [15–18]. Cosmography is essentially a Taylor expansions in cosmology. Derivatives of the scale factor a (or of the Hubble parameter $H \equiv \dot{a}/a$) are naturally model-independent, but they are strongly related to the values of the parameters of any extended model. Sometimes, one refers to cosmography as *cosmo-kinetics*, in which one expands the main observable quantities in terms of the cosmic time.[1] [19, 20]

The main purpose of this work is to extend previous literature on cosmographic approaches in the field of extended theories (*c.f.* [21–23] and references therein). In doing so, we shall match cosmography with different classes of extended theories of gravity, making no further assumptions in the parameter space of the gravitational theories under scrutiny. This was in fact a common denominator shared by all previous works, which either prevented capture of essential trends in the classes of models under consideration or over/underestimated the power of cosmography as a competitive technique capable of reconstructing or constraining underlying theories. We shall consider different tests such as type Ia supernovae Union 2.1 compilation, baryonic acoustic oscillation (BAO) data and Hubble rate measurements.

In the following sections we shall deal with competitive extended theories of gravity, namely quintessence theories, extended teleparallel gravity theories, dubbed $F(\mathcal{T})$, and $f(R)$ gravity theories.

Cosmographic studies in these theories have been limited to recent research [23, 24] which proved how limited such a technique is when compared to Gaussian processes of reconstruction [25]. Moreover the usual approximation that the matter content today can be related to the cosmographic parameter q_0 as happens in ΛCDM was made, limiting the generality of the obtained results therein.

The second class of theories in our analysis is the so-called extended Teleparallel gravity theories, dubbed $F(\mathcal{T})$. In these theories the covariant action is written in terms of an arbitrary function of the torsion scalar $\mathcal{T}$, which indeed extends the usual teleparallel gravity (*c.f.* [26–31] for further insight), a gravitational theory associated to the translation group where a Minkowskian tangent spacetime is associated with every point of the spacetime. Thus, these theories are constructed, instead of the usual Levi-Civita connection, in terms of the Weitzenböck connection, which induces a non-zero torsion but a vanishing Riemann tensor. This fact enables us to transport the so-called vierbeins/tetrads fields in parallel, providing the name of the theory.

Dark energy can be accommodated in the framework of these theories [32] and since, unlike $f(R)$ theories, the field equations are still second-order, gravitational waves do not exhibit extra modes [33]. On the other hand, as it is widely known, extensions of Teleparallel gravity are not Lorentz invariant (see ref. [34, 35]), and suffer from issues with acausality and non-uniqueness [36–38]. The field equations will be sensitive to the choice of tetrads and consequently, the determination of the correct tetrad fields, leading to a metric tensor with some desirable symmetries, has attracted some attention in recent years. For instance studies have been devoted to cosmological solutions [39], the Schwarzschild solution [40–47], the validity of Birkhoff's theorem [41, 48, 49] and finally junction conditions [50], proving the interest in such theories. Nonetheless, very few references have been devoted so far to cosmographic techniques for this class of theories. In [51], the authors extracted some constraints on the redshift transition determining the onset of cosmic acceleration, employing cosmography to obtain bounds on the viable $F(\mathcal{T})$ forms and performed a Monte Carlo fitting using supernovae data.

Finally we shall complete our analysis with the study of theories including invariants constructed with the Riemann tensor contractions. Pioneering works [52–54] found that one-loop quantum corrections to the vacuum expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor generate terms containing higher-order curvature invariants, such as R^2, $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$, etc., with typical couplings of the order of the Planck mass by the appropriate (negative) power. Therefore, such quantum corrections are relevant

[1] Or alternatively in terms of the redshift z.

only at very large curvatures which originally gave rise to the interest in $f(R)$ theories, which might be thought of as the only local, metric-based and generally coordinate invariant and stable modifications of gravity [55, 56]. This perspective has now changed. Recent results also show that when quantum corrections or string theory are taken into account, higher-order curvature invariants may appear naturally in the effective low-energy Lagrangian [57–59]. Anyhow, $f(R)$ theories have remained a paradigmatic example of extended theories of gravity (*c.f.* [9, 10, 60–65] for extensive reviews and citations therein) capable of avoiding several classes of instabilities, providing inflationary mechanisms [54, 66–72], accounting for the dark matter component [73, 74], ensuring the correct growth of large-scale structures [75–78] and passing a multitude of tests in several astrophysical scales [79–86]. Some cosmographic studies were made in the context of $f(R)$ theories [21, 87] although the present cosmological values of the first and second derivatives of the gravitational Lagrangian were therein fixed to their GR counterparts.[2] However, whenever $\mathrm{d}^2 f/\mathrm{d}R^2 = 0$, either a singularity or instability occurs [85, 88]. In the event of those parameters not being fixed, a one-to-one correspondence between the $f(R)$-derivatives and the cosmographic parameters is no longer possible [23, 24] which forces a sensible prior assumption over these derivatives or complementary tests. Anyhow, these attempts led to limited constraints on $f(R)$ models [23, 24] that we intend to extend herein.

The paper is organised as follows:[3] In Section 2 we sketch the approach to generalise the cosmographic method to extended theories of gravity. In 2.1, we provide a quick review of the cosmographic method and how both luminosity and angular distances can be parametrised using cosmographic parameters. Then in 2.2 we describe our approach and a number of limitations that the cosmographic method suffers from when it is applied to higher-order theories of gravity, for example the need to introduce extra parameters and priors or physical intervals on these parameters. We also presented the catalogues used in this paper, as well as the expected usefulness of each dataset. In Section 3 we present the required dictionaries connecting the cosmographic parameters and the appropriate parameters which characterise the theories under consideration, namely quintessence, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories in 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 respectively. Then in Section 5 we present our main results, after extensive use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) analyses for each of the aforementioned theories, providing the used priors - if any - and the statistical constraints for the parameters of each theory. This enables us to reconstruct the best fits. Combined and independent analyses of Supernovae, BAO and $H(z)$ data are then presented. We end the paper in Section 6, giving our conclusions and discussing future strategies.

2 Cosmographic approach in extended theories

In this section, we shall briefly present the role of cosmography in standard cosmology, with particular attention devoted to its application to extended theories of gravity to be developed in the upcoming sections.

2.1 Basics of Cosmography

In its modern interpretation, cosmography makes sole use of the Cosmological Copernican principle, without any further assumptions [89], which naturally leads to the Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker (FLRW) metric describing a homogeneous and isotropic Universe. We can expand the cosmological scale factor $a(t)$ around the present time t_0 as:

$$a(t) = \sum_{j=0} \frac{a^{(j)}(t_0)}{j!} (t - t_0)^j \,, \tag{2.1}$$

and one can easily show that its derivatives are intimately related to observable quantities of cosmological interest.

In particular, the cosmographic coefficients:[4], are determined as scale factor derivatives evaluated

[2] Bear in mind that cosmological values today, for such derivatives, may differ from their GR counterparts and still produce viable cosmological models.

[3] Unless otherwise specified, natural units $\hbar = k_B = c = 1$ will be used throughout this paper and $8\pi G \equiv 8\pi G$ with G being the standard gravitational constant.

[4] Usually defined as *cosmographic series*.

at the present time [90]

$$H=\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\,,\quad q=-\frac{\ddot{a}}{aH^2}\,,\quad j=\frac{a^{(3)}}{aH^3}\,,\quad s=\frac{a^{(4)}}{aH^4}\,, \tag{2.2}$$

where dots represent cosmic time derivatives. Also, in terms of the observable Hubble rate H the cosmographic coefficients become:

$$q=-\frac{\dot{H}}{H^2}-1\,,\quad j=\frac{\ddot{H}}{H^3}-3q-2\,,\quad s=\frac{H^{(3)}}{H^4}+4j+3q\,(q+4)+6\,, \tag{2.3}$$

Cosmography may quantify the amount and time evolution of dark energy which is effectively required to permit the Universe to accelerate, as indicated by current observations.

2.2 Cosmography Beyond the Standard Cosmological Model

As mentioned above, we intend to consider three extensions of GR, namely quintessence, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories. The aim is to employ the cosmographic approach, that is to perform a Taylor expansion in powers of time or redshift around the present time, in order to derive constraints on model parameters.

One should always be careful when combining modified gravity theories and cosmological observations. Indeed, cosmography itself relies on the assumptions of homogeneity and isotropy, so clearly it would be impossible to test any modified gravity theory or cosmology without such properties. As far as SNIa and $H(z)$ measurements are concerned, they only depend on the expansion history so we can safely use such data to test modified gravity theories. BAO measurements present subtleties (see also below), because the BAO scale can be used as a standard ruler only under certain assumptions about the evolution of (linear) perturbations, which in general differs between ΛCDM and alternative theories. However, it has been shown [91] for a wide class of theories, which include quintessence and $f(R)$, that one can indeed use BAO as a test of gravity. For $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories, the situation is less clear because of several problems affecting these theories as was mentioned in the introduction. Nevertheless, a comprehensive analysis of BAO within $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories is well beyond the scope of this work, and hardly compatible with the notion of generality we would like to preserve. Implicitly, our results on $F(\mathcal{T})$ (and indeed other models as well) assume that we are dealing with reasonably "well-behaved" theories.

We run multiple MCMC reconstruction chains using a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm [92–94], where we have previously defined convenient combinations of the derivatives in the gravitational Lagrangians for every class of theories under investigation. To do so, we consider derivatives of $V(\phi)$, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ with respect to the redshift z and we compare with Union2.1 [95], BAO [96–99] and $H(z)$ [100, 101] datasets.

Before proceeding, let us start by expressing both the luminosity (d_L) and angular (d_A) distances in the cosmographic expansions as follows:

$$d_{L,A}(z)=\frac{z}{H_0}(1+\eta_1 z+\eta_2 z^2+\eta_3 z^3+\dots)\,, \tag{2.4a}$$

$$\eta_{1,L}=\frac{1}{2}-\frac{q_0}{2}\,, \tag{2.4b}$$

$$\eta_{2,L}=-\frac{1}{6}-\frac{j_0}{6}+\frac{q_0}{6}+\frac{q_0^2}{2}\,, \tag{2.4c}$$

$$\eta_{3,L}=\frac{1}{12}+\frac{5j_0}{24}-\frac{q_0}{12}+\frac{5j_0q_0}{12}-\frac{5q_0^2}{8}-\frac{5q_0^3}{8}+\frac{s_0}{24} \tag{2.4d}$$

$$\eta_{1,A}=-\left(\frac{3}{2}+\frac{q_0}{2}\right)\,, \tag{2.4e}$$

$$\eta_{2,A}=\frac{11}{6}-\frac{j_0}{6}+\frac{7q_0}{6}+\frac{q_0^2}{2}\,, \tag{2.4f}$$

$$\eta_{3,A}=-\frac{25}{12}+\frac{13j_0}{24}-\frac{23q_0}{12}+\frac{5j_0q_0}{12}-\frac{13q_0^2}{8}-\frac{5q_0^3}{8}+\frac{s_0}{24}\,. \tag{2.4g}$$

The above coefficients, entering eq. (2.4), as evaluated in the current epoch, are called the deceleration parameter, q_0, which specifies whether the Universe is experiencing either an accelerating ($-1 < q_0 < 0$) or decelerating ($q_0 > 0$) phase; the jerk term, j_0, which gives us information about the change of acceleration; and the the snap parameter s_0, which defines the slope of the luminosity curve at higher redshifts. For example, at the level of ΛCDM model with $\Omega_m = 0.318$, $\Omega_k = 0$, one gets $q_0 = -0.523$, $j_0 = 1$ and $s_0 = -0.431$.

2.3 Problems and Shortcomings of Cosmography

One of the shortcomings of the cosmographic approach appears obvious when one considers that the expansion parameter (the redshift) is not necessarily small, in fact it can assume values larger than unity. This can generate convergence problems, and makes the truncation at a finite expansion order at least questionable. To overcome this problem, cosmographic reconstructions often employ auxiliary parametrisations of cosmic distances, which commonly involve new choices of independent variables[5] built up in terms of the redshift z. However, the viability of such analyses has recently been put into question, due to increasing propagation of errors and difficulties in understanding what the most suitable parametrisation at a statistical level is [23, 24]. Such combinations of redshift z seemed to lead to biased results, not being for instance even able to unveil ΛCDM as the theory responsible for mock data precisely generated from an exact ΛCDM model. Thus we have opted to perform the cosmographic expansions in terms of redshift z.

We mention that we have carried out our whole analysis in terms of both y_1 and y_2 as well, although we do not present the results in this paper. In both cases, the mean values are compatible with those of the z analysis, but the standard errors are much larger, up to several orders of magnitude in the case of y_1. This somewhat confirms the problems with alternative variables mentioned above.

In this work, we are mostly interested in testing the potential of the cosmographic approach to constrain modified gravity theories. In other words, what is interesting for us the *precision* of the results, simply put the "error bars", rather than their *accuracy*, i.e. the statistical bias. As we will see below, one can easily recognize such bias in how results for the (truncated) ΛCDM model are modified when considering $z < 1$ and all–z datasets. However, error bars remain of the same order or magnitude and actually practically identical in the two cases.

Unsurprisingly (see below), our results our compatible with the ΛCDM limit of each model within 1-σ. Hence, regardless of the statistical bias introduced by using a finite expansion despite $z > 1$, it is ultimately the precision of the results what has the biggest impact on our potential to constrain alternative gravity models. The goal of this paper is not to show how *much* cosmography is able to tell us about modified gravity theories, but rather how *little*. This is the reason why we have decided to use the full dataset, including data points at $z > 1$.

3 Constraining Alternative Theories with Cosmography

In this section, we consider the above requirements of cosmography to relate Universe's kinematics to particular classes of dark energy models. In particular, cosmography turns out to be a model independent treatment to obtain bounds on cosmic observables, but by virtue of (2.3), one can match the cosmographic expectations with the theoretical predictions of any dark energy model. First of all, we must find a way to uniquely express the cosmographic parameters in terms of model parameters, so that constrains on the former can be translated into constraints on the latter, which are what we are most interested in.

3.1 Quintessence Theories

Let us consider as a first example of our method a minimally coupled scalar field ϕ plus the standard Einstein-Hilbert action, i.e., *quintessence* dark-energy models [103–106] of the form:

$$\mathcal{S}_\phi = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{R}{16\pi G} - \frac{1}{2}g^{\mu\nu}\partial_\mu\phi\,\partial_\nu\phi - V(\phi) + \mathcal{L}_m\right] , \tag{3.1}$$

[5] Two immediate examples are $y_1 = \frac{z}{1+z}$ and $y_2 = \arctan(z)$. For further examples see for instance [102].

where $\mathcal{L}_m$ is the matter Lagrangian density and $V(\phi)$ is the scalar field potential. In a FLRW Universe, the field equations read

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}\left[\rho_m + \frac{\dot{\phi}^2}{2} + V(\phi)\right], \tag{3.2a}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{8\pi G}{2}\left[\rho_m(1+w_m) + \dot{\phi}^2\right], \tag{3.2b}$$

$$\ddot{\phi} + 3H\dot{\phi} + V_\phi = 0\,, \tag{3.2c}$$

where we have assumed that matter is well-described by a perfect fluid with constant equation of state $P_m = w_m\rho_m$. Indeed, we will consider the dust case $w_m = 0$, which is an excellent approximation for both baryonic and dark matter at late times ($z \lesssim 1.5$). Thus, we will parametrise the matter energy density in the usual way:

$$8\pi G\rho_m = 3H_0^2\Omega_m(1+z)^3\,. \tag{3.3}$$

Let us also define:

$$\widetilde{V}_0 = \frac{8\pi G}{H_0^2}V_0 - 3(1-\Omega_m)\,, \tag{3.4a}$$

$$\widetilde{V}_i = \frac{8\pi G}{H_0^2}\left.\frac{\partial^i V}{\partial z^i}\right|_{z=0}\,,\ i=1,2\,, \tag{3.4b}$$

$$\tag{3.4c}$$

This choice guarantees that these parameters are dimensionless and that ΛCDM corresponds to the limit in which all parameters vanish, i.e. $\widetilde{V}_i = 0$ $(i = 0,1,2)$. Then, using all the expressions in eqs. (3.2), the first and second derivatives of (3.2b) and the first derivative of (3.2c), we are able to express q, j, s in terms of the three parameters $\widetilde{V}_0, \widetilde{V}_1, \widetilde{V}_2$ plus Ω_m. Thus the cosmographic parameters when evaluated today read

$$q_0 = -1 + \frac{3\Omega_m}{2} - \widetilde{V}_0\,, \tag{3.5a}$$

$$j_0 = 1 - 3\widetilde{V}_0 - \widetilde{V}_1\,, \tag{3.5b}$$

$$s_0 = 1 - \frac{9\Omega_m}{2} - 3\widetilde{V}_0^2 + \widetilde{V}_0\left(18 - \widetilde{V}_1 + \frac{9\Omega_m}{2}\right) + \frac{3\widetilde{V}_1(2+\Omega_m)}{2} + \widetilde{V}_2\,. \tag{3.5c}$$

3.2 $F(\mathcal{T})$ Theories

Let us now consider extended theories of teleparallel gravity [32, 107–109], whose action reads

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\, e\left[\frac{F(\mathcal{T})}{2\kappa^2} + \mathcal{L}_m\right], \tag{3.6}$$

where $e = \det\left(e_\mu^A\right) = \sqrt{-g}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ is the torsion scalar (see e.g. [31]). The field equations for a FLRW Universe read

$$H^2 = \frac{\rho_m + \rho_{F(\mathcal{T})}}{3}\,, \tag{3.7a}$$

$$\dot{H} = -\frac{\rho_m + \rho_{F(\mathcal{T})} + P_{F(\mathcal{T})}}{3}\,, \tag{3.7b}$$

with

$$\rho_{F(\mathcal{T})} = \frac{J_1}{2}\,, \quad P_{F(\mathcal{T})} = -\frac{J_1 + 4J_2}{2}\,, \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$J_1 = -\mathcal{T} - F + 2\mathcal{T}F'\,, \quad J_2 = \dot{H}(1 - F' - 2\mathcal{T}F'')\,. \tag{3.9}$$

with prime above denoting derivative with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Moreover, the torsion scalar is simply $\mathcal{T} = -6H^2$. Let us define:

$$F_i = \mathcal{T}^{i-1} \left. \frac{\partial^i F}{\partial \mathcal{T}^i} \right|_{z=0} , \tag{3.10a}$$

which are dimensionless quantities. Then, using (3.7) and the first redshift derivative of (3.7b) yields

$$q_0 = -1 + \frac{3\Omega_m}{2(F_1 + 2F_2)} , \tag{3.11a}$$

$$j_0 = 1 - \frac{9\Omega_m^2(3F_2 + 2F_3)}{2(F_1 + 2F_2)^3} , \tag{3.11b}$$

$$s_0 = 1 + \frac{-9\Omega_m}{2(F_1 + 2F_2)} + \frac{45(3F_2 + 2F_3)\Omega_m^2}{2(F_1 + 2F_2)^3} + \frac{27(3F_2 + 12F_3 + 4F_4)\Omega_m^3}{4(F_1 + 2F_2)^4} + \\ + \frac{-81(3F_2 + 2F_3)^2\Omega_m^3}{2(F_1 + 2F_2)^5} . \tag{3.11c}$$

We have also used the usual parametrisation (3.3). It appears that we are left with four independent parameters (besides Ω_m), namely F_i $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$, which allow us to only obtain three cosmographic parameters (q, j, s). However, rescaling all quantities as follows:

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_m = \frac{\Omega_m}{F_1} , \qquad \widetilde{F}_j = \frac{F_j}{F_1} \quad (j = 2, 3, 4) , \tag{3.12}$$

we are able to eliminate F_1 from (3.11) entirely, finding

$$q_0 = -1 + \frac{3\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)} , \tag{3.13a}$$

$$j_0 = 1 - \frac{9\widetilde{\Omega}_m^2(3\widetilde{F}_2 + 2\widetilde{F}_3)}{2(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)^3} , \tag{3.13b}$$

$$s_0 = 1 + \frac{-9\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)} + \frac{45\left(3\widetilde{F}_2 + 2\widetilde{F}_3\right)\widetilde{\Omega}_m^2}{2(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)^3} + \frac{27(3\widetilde{F}_2 + 12\widetilde{F}_3 + 4\widetilde{F}_4)\widetilde{\Omega}_m^3}{4(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)^4} + \\ + \frac{-81(3\widetilde{F}_2 + 2\widetilde{F}_3)^2\widetilde{\Omega}_m^3}{2(1 + 2\widetilde{F}_2)^5} . \tag{3.13c}$$

As in the case of quintessence theories, the parametrisation above is such that ΛCDM is recovered when all the introduced parameters are zero, i.e., $\widetilde{F}_i = 0$ $(i = 2, 3, 4)$. Furthermore, the expression for the present value of the function $F(\mathcal{T})$ yields:

$$\widetilde{F}_0 = \left. \frac{F(\mathcal{T})}{\mathcal{T}} \right|_{z=0} = 2 - \widetilde{\Omega}_m . \tag{3.14}$$

Unlike $f(R)$ theories (see below), $\widetilde{F}_0$ in eq. (3.14) is determined from the field equations with no dependence on parameters other than Ω_m, which is inferred from the data fits. This reflects the fact that $\widetilde{F}_0$ does not appear in the expressions for the cosmographic parameters (3.13). Notice that we have introduced the parameter $\widetilde{\Omega}_m$ in (3.12), accounting for the correct definition of the matter (baryons plus cold dark matter) density parameter, despite depending on $\widetilde{F}_1$. The reason is obviously that $\widetilde{F}_1$ acts as a rescaling factor for the Newton constant $G_{N,\text{eff}} = G_{N,\text{bare}}/F_1$, so what is actually probed by cosmological observations is $G_{N,\text{bare}}\,\Omega_m = G_{N,\text{eff}}\,\widetilde{\Omega}_m$. Solar system tests put strict bounds on deviations of $G_{N,\text{eff}}$ from the value of G_N measured in Earth-bound experiments, but as is widely known, for $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories (see section 3.3) $G_{N,\text{eff}}$ turns out to be a function of density, so

we cannot trivially extend Solar system bounds to cosmological scales and densities. As we have just shown, the cosmographic history of the Universe is unaffected by changes in F_1, provided that all other parameters are rescaled accordingly.

Interestingly, rescaling all parameters – including Ω_m – by an additional factor $(1+2\widetilde{F}_2)$, such a factor disappears from the denominators in (3.13) which leads to particularly simple expressions for q_0, j_0 and s_0. However, we would lose the direct physical interpretation of $\widetilde{\Omega}_m$, so we use the definitions (3.13) even though they are slightly more complicated.

3.3 $f(R)$ Theories

As a third example, we consider theories of gravity which are derived from the gravitational action [9, 10, 62]:

$$\mathcal{S} = \int \mathrm{d}^4x\sqrt{-g}\left[\frac{1}{16\pi G}f(R)+\mathcal{L}_m\right], \tag{3.15}$$

The FLRW field equations, when assuming the so-called metric formalism, reduce to

$$3f_R H^2 = 8\pi G\rho_m + \frac{Rf_R - f}{2} + 3(1+z)H^2 f_{RR}R' , \tag{3.16a}$$

$$2f_R HH' = 8\pi G\rho_m + (1+z)H^2 f_{RR}R' + (1+z)H\partial_z[(1+z)Hf_{RR}R'] . \tag{3.16b}$$

where we have used z as independent variable and defined $f_R \equiv \partial f/\partial R$ and analogously for higher derivatives. Thus, introducing the following definitions,

$$\alpha = f_R|_{z=0} , \tag{3.17a}$$

$$\beta^2 = \frac{6H_0^2}{\alpha}\, f_{RR}|_{z=0} , \tag{3.17b}$$

$$\widetilde{\Omega}_m = \frac{\Omega_m}{\alpha} , \tag{3.17c}$$

$$\widetilde{f}_0 = \frac{1}{6H_0^2\alpha}\, f|_{z=0} - 1 + \frac{\Omega_m}{2} , \tag{3.17d}$$

$$\widetilde{f}_1 = \frac{1}{6H_0^2\alpha}\left.\frac{\partial f}{\partial z}\right|_{z=0} - \frac{3\Omega_m}{2} , \tag{3.17e}$$

$$\widetilde{f}_2 = \frac{1}{6H_0^2\alpha}\left.\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial z^2}\right|_{z=0} - 3\Omega_m , \tag{3.17f}$$

and using (3.16) we find:

$$q_0 = -1 + \frac{3\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2} - \widetilde{f}_0 + \beta^2\left(\widetilde{f}_1 + \frac{3\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2}\right) , \tag{3.18a}$$

$$j_0 = 1 - \widetilde{f}_0 - \widetilde{f}_1 + \beta^2\left(\widetilde{f}_1 + \frac{3\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2}\right) , \tag{3.18b}$$

$$s_0 = 1 - \frac{9\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2} - \widetilde{f}_0^2 + \widetilde{f}_1 + \widetilde{f}_2 + \frac{3\widetilde{f}_1\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2} + \widetilde{f}_0\left(6 - \widetilde{f}_1 + \frac{3\widetilde{\Omega}_m}{2}\right) - \frac{\beta^4(2\widetilde{f}_1 + 3\widetilde{\Omega}_m)^2}{4}$$
$$- \frac{\beta^2}{2}(6 - 2\widetilde{f}_0 + 3\widetilde{\Omega}_m)(2\widetilde{f}_1 + 3\widetilde{\Omega}_m) . \tag{3.18c}$$

Notice that like the case of F_1 for $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories, the first derivative $\alpha \equiv f_{R,0}$ has disappeared from the expressions. In fact, it simply corresponds to a rescaling of the Newton's constant. As in the previous cases, we have defined (3.17) in such a way that ΛCDM corresponds to $\widetilde{f}_i$'s and β equal to zero.

Notice that for $f(R)$ theories the mapping between cosmographic and model parameters is not bijective:

$$(q_0, j_0, s_0) \quad \leftrightarrow \quad (\widetilde{f}_0, \widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2, \beta)\,. \tag{3.19}$$

This is a general feature of theories with extra degrees of freedom, as is the case for $f(R)$ gravity (one extra scalar).

4 Datasets

We perform cosmological fits to the various theories described above using several low-redshift datasets: SNIa luminosity distance, $H(z)$ and BAO measurements. These measurements are independent and uncorrelated, thus the total likelihood is taken to be the product of the individual likelihoods, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm tot} = \mathcal{L}_{\rm SNIa} \times \mathcal{L}_{H(z)} \times \mathcal{L}_{\rm BAO}\,, \tag{4.1}$$

and each likelihood is defined as proportional to the exponential of the corresponding χ^2:

$$\mathcal{L}_i = \exp\left(-\chi_i^2/2\right) \qquad i = \{\mathrm{BAO}, H(z), \mathrm{SNIa}\}\,. \tag{4.2}$$

4.1 Type Ia Supernovae

We use SNIa luminosity distance measurements collected in the Union2.1 catalogue [110]. It contains 580 sources at redshifts $z \leq 1.414$, analysed with the SALT-II lightcurve fitter. The distance modulus $\mu \equiv m - M$ is the difference between the observed and absolute magnitude of the object. For a homogeneous, isotropic and spatially flat Universe, it is given by

$$\mu(z;\boldsymbol{\theta}) = m(z;\boldsymbol{\theta}) - M = 5\log\frac{d_L(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})}{10\,\mathrm{pc}}\,, \tag{4.3}$$

with the luminosity distance

$$d_L(z;\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{(1+z)}{H_0}\int_0^z \frac{d\zeta}{H(\zeta;\boldsymbol{\theta})/H_0}\,. \tag{4.4}$$

We denote with $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ all cosmological and model parameters other than z. SNIa are standard (or at least standardisable) candles and thus their absolute magnitude is assumed to be constant for each supernova, although its (unknown) value is completely degenerate with H_0. Indeed, when fitting cosmological data one should marginalise over the *nuisance parameter* Δ_M which depends on H_0 and M, defined by

$$\mu^{\rm fit}(z_i) = \mu^{\rm Union2.1}(z_i) + \Delta_M\,. \tag{4.5}$$

In the fits, we assume a wide flat prior[6]

$$\Delta_M = \mathrm{Uniform}(-2, 2)\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Because we are dealing with fully generic models, $H(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is not known a priori and we cannot use (4.4) but rather (2.4). This makes our analysis less accurate because of the finite expansion order, but also more generic because we do not assume any specific model within a given class of theories.

The total χ^2 for SN data is

$$\chi^2_{\rm SNIa} = \sum_{i=1}^{580}\left[\frac{\mu_i^{\rm fit} - \mu^{\rm th}(z_i;\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\sigma_i^2}\right]^2\,, \tag{4.7}$$

where $\mu^{\rm th}(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})$ holds for the theoretical value of the distance modulus at a given redshift and for a given combination of model and cosmological parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

[6] Best fits are of the order of $\Delta M \sim 0.05$, with similar 2–σ errors.

Survey	z	d_z	Ref.
6dFGS	0.106	0.3360 ± 0.0150	[96]
MGS	0.15	0.2239 ± 0.0084	[97]
BOSS LOWZ	0.32	0.1181 ± 0.0024	[98]
SDSS(R)	0.35	0.1126 ± 0.0022	[99]
BOSS CMASS	0.57	0.0726 ± 0.0007	[98]

Table 1. BAO d_z data. The measurements come from several experiments as indicated, and are uncorrelated.

z	$A(z)$
0.44	0.474 ± 0.034
0.60	0.442 ± 0.020
0.73	0.424 ± 0.021

Table 2. BAO WiggleZ data [111]. The relative covariance matrix is reported in (4.13).

4.2 The Hubble Rate compilation

The second dataset we consider is the list of Hubble rate measurements at different redshifts. We employ the most recent compilation [100, 101], which takes into account 28 pairs of $(H_i,\, z_i)$ with associated errors.

This catalogue represents a novel approach to tracking the Universe's expansion history, providing massive early type galaxies as cosmic chronometers. In fact, the procedure for evaluating $(H_i,\, z_i)$ relies on estimating the differential time $\frac{dt}{dz}$ through different astronomical measurements on galaxies, and then comparing these measurements with the cosmological redshifts at which such galaxies are located. The key relation is

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{\mathrm{d}t} = -(1+z)\, H(z)\,, \tag{4.8}$$

which allows us to infer $H(z)$ in the right-hand side, once $\frac{dz}{dt}$ and z are independently measured. For our analyses, we use the 28 $H(z)$ measurements reported in ref. [101], with the list of data spanning in the redshift interval $z \in [0.09, 2.30]$.

4.3 Baryon Acoustic Oscillations

Baryon Acoustic Oscillations (BAO) represent a typical correlation scale in the matter distribution, and they indeed represent an excellent tool to probe the cosmological history, particularly a combination of the angular diameter distance and the redshift separation. In fact, the typical BAO observable is

$$d_z(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \frac{r_\mathrm{s}(z_\mathrm{drag})}{D_V(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})}\,, \tag{4.9}$$

where $r_\mathrm{s}(z_\mathrm{drag})$ is the comoving sound horizon at the drag epoch, and

$$D_V^3(z) \equiv \frac{z\, d_L^2(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})}{(1+z)^2 H(z;\boldsymbol{\theta})}\,. \tag{4.10}$$

is the volume-averaged distance, see e.g. [112]. The quantity $r_\mathrm{s}(z_\mathrm{drag})$ must be calibrated assuming a fiducial cosmological model, the Planck data giving [113]

$$z_\mathrm{drag} = 1059.62 \pm 0.31\,, \quad r_\mathrm{s}(z_\mathrm{drag}) = 147.41 \pm 0.30\,. \tag{4.11}$$

However, such a calibration is impossible without assuming a particular cosmology until redshifts $z \gtrsim 10^3$. This clearly clashes with the idea of keeping our analysis fully general. Although not fully consistent, the Planck value should be safely applicable to any model which does not depart too drastically from ΛCDM until much lower redshifts, and in which (linear) structure growth is not too severely modified (see also the discussion in section 2.2). For this reason, we will assume the Gaussian prior (4.11) throughout our analysis.

In addition to the d_z data, we also use data from the WiggleZ collaboration [111]. The observable best suited to cosmological fits is in this case $A(z)$, defined by

$$A(z) = \frac{100 D_V(z)\sqrt{\widetilde{\Omega}_m h^2}}{c\, z}\,, \tag{4.12}$$

Parameter	Prior
Ω_m	Uniform(0,1)
h_0	Uniform(20,120)
q_0	Uniform(-5,5)
j_0	Uniform(-20,20)
s_0	Uniform(-100,100)
Δ_M	Uniform(-2,2)
$r_s(z_{\rm drag})$	Normal(147.41,0.30)

Table 3. Priors for cosmological parameters. The prior on $r_s(z_{\rm drag})$ is the Planck value (4.11). The flat priors on (q_0, j_0, s_0) result in flat priors on model parameters for quintessence and $f(R)$, but a non-uniform prior on $\widetilde{F}_2$ (see text for details).

where $h \equiv H_0/(100\,{\rm km\,s^{-1}Mpc^{-1}})$. This quantity is independent of H_0, because $D_V \sim H_0^{-1}$.

At this stage let us stress that in $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories, as mentioned above, the relevant parameter is actually $\widetilde{\Omega}_m$ and not the "bare" Ω_m. In the case of quintessence theories, $\widetilde{\Omega}_m = \Omega_m$.

The WiggleZ data are shown in Table 2. These data points are correlated, with covariance matrix:[7]

$$C^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1040.3 & -807.5 & 336.8 \\ & 3720.3 & -1551.9 \\ & & 2914.9 \end{pmatrix} . \tag{4.13}$$

Accordingly the expression for the χ^2 must be suitably modified to include the correlation in (4.13). Thus the total χ^2 for BAO data becomes

$$\chi^2_{\rm BAO} = \chi^2_{d_z} + \chi^2_{\rm WiggleZ}\,, \tag{4.14}$$

with

$$\chi^2_{d_z} = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \left[\frac{d_{z\,i}^{\rm obs} - d_z^{\rm th}(z_i)}{\sigma_d} \right]^2 , \quad \chi^2_{\rm WiggleZ} = (\mathbf{A}^{\rm obs} - \mathbf{A}^{\rm th})^T C^{-1} (\mathbf{A}^{\rm obs} - \mathbf{A}^{\rm th})\,. \tag{4.15}$$

5 Numerical results

5.1 Fitting Procedure

We fit our models using each dataset individually and then combine all three datasets, assuming flat priors on cosmological parameters, with the exception of $r_s(z_{\rm drag})$ as given in eq. (4.11), for which we have used a Gaussian prior at the Planck best value (see Table 3, and section 4.3 for further details). Note that Δ_M only enters the SNIa analysis where it is completely degenerate with h_0; we therefore are unable to constrain it using any dataset individually. For the same reason, h_0 is unconstrained by SNIa data unlike in the case of BAO and $H(z)$ measurements. When combining all data, we are able to put constraints on both h_0 and Δ_M.

For both quintessence and $f(R)$ theories, the choice of flat priors on (q_0, j_0, s_0) is equivalent to flat priors on the theory parameters $(\widetilde{V}_0, \widetilde{V}_1, \widetilde{V}_2)$ and $(\widetilde{f}_0, \widetilde{f}_1, \widetilde{f}_2, \beta)$ respectively. The Jacobians of the transformations (3.5) and (3.18) are simply constants. Since $f(R)$ theories possess one parameter more than the other theories under consideration, we have actually been forced to specify the prior on β because it is not implied by table 3; thus we have chosen the wide flat prior

$$\beta = {\rm Uniform}(-100, 100)\,. \tag{5.1}$$

One can easily check a posteriori that the posterior distributions lie well within the assumed priors.

[7] Only the upper half of the symmetric covariance matrix is shown.

Parameter	$z < 1$	All–z
	Exact ΛCDM	
h_0	$69.1^{+1.4}_{-1.4}(69.1)$	$69.3^{+1.2}_{-1.2}(69.3)$
Δ_M	$-0.023^{+0.037}_{-0.041}(-0.028)$	$-0.019^{+0.035}_{-0.035}(-0.015)$
Ω_m	$0.291^{+0.037}_{-0.035}(0.289)$	$0.283^{+0.025}_{-0.023}(0.283)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.8/(581 d.o.f.)	584.5/(616 d.o.f.)
	Truncated ΛCDM	
h_0	$69.5^{+1.4}_{-1.4}(69.3)$	$70.2^{+1.5}_{-1.5}(70.1)$
Δ_M	$-0.014^{+0.040}_{-0.040}(-0.021)$	$-0.003^{+0.040}_{-0.040}(-0.0054)$
Ω_m	$0.278^{+0.034}_{-0.032}(0.278)$	$0.248^{+0.031}_{-0.028}(0.240)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.2/(581 d.o.f.)	601.5/(616 d.o.f.)

Table 4. Summary of results for the exact and truncated ΛCDM models. Reported correspond to 95% confidence levels; best-fit values are in brackets.



Figure 1. Comparison between exact and truncated ΛCDM models. The inferred values for Ω_m are essentially compatible at roughly 1-σ. We notice that the truncated model gives slightly lower values of Ω_m than the exact one, and that $z < 1$ give slightly larger values of Ω_m compared to the all–z data.

In the case of $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories, the dependence between cosmographic and model parameters is less trivial as seen in eqs. (3.13). Then, denoting $Q_i \equiv (q_0, j_0, s_0)$ and $F_i \equiv (\widetilde{F}_0, \widetilde{F}_1, \widetilde{F}_2)$, we have

$$\det J_{ij} \equiv \det \frac{\partial Q_i}{\partial F_j} \propto \frac{\widetilde{\Omega}_m^6}{(1+2\widetilde{F}_2)^9} \,. \tag{5.2}$$

Therefore, a flat prior on cosmographic parameters results in a prior on $\widetilde{F}_2$, which has a penalty for large $\widetilde{F}_2$ proportional to $(1+2\widetilde{F}_2)^{-9}$. Inspection of (3.13) reveals that at large values of $\widetilde{F}_2$, variations in $\widetilde{F}_2$ have little effect on cosmographic parameters, in particular $q_0 \simeq -1$. When the MCMC chains explore such tails, a flat prior on $\widetilde{F}_2$ may result in an almost unconstrained progression towards $\widetilde{F}_2 \to \infty$ with little increase in the volume of the effective parameter space, i.e., the cosmographic parameter space, being explored. This problem is avoided choosing flat priors on cosmographic parameters.

We should emphasise that while we choose flat priors on (q_0, j_0, s_0), our fits use the model parameters directly, following the prescriptions (3.5, 3.13, 3.18), with a completely independent analysis for each model.

Finally, let us mention that we have firstly considered only the data at redshifts $z < 1$, which are 22 and 551 data points for $H(z)$ and SNIa measurements, respectively and have then repeated the analysis for the full datasets. This is to check the consistency of using a finite expansion in z at somewhat large redshifts $z < 1$. For BAO, the full dataset are contained in $z < 1$, so the same data will be used in both fits. We have run MCMC fitting codes equipped with a Gelman-Rubin convergence diagnostics, and performed the statistical analysis using publicly available `Python` codes.[8]

5.2 Exact vs. Truncated ΛCDM

For a straightforward comparison with modified gravity theories, let us first present the results for ΛCDM, for which the only free parameter is Ω_m. Note that the approach one takes when fitting data to ΛCDM is intrinsically different than other cosmological theories, because for ΛCDM an exact solution $H(z)$ is at hand and therefore also analytical expressions for all cosmological observables, which can be integrated numerically for any z and parameter combination. For the other theories

[8] http://getdist.readthedocs.org/en/latest/.



Parameter	$z < 1$	All–z
h_0	$69.8^{+2.1}_{-2.0}(70.1)$	$69.4^{+1.8}_{-1.8}(69.5)$
Δ_M	$-0.007^{+0.050}_{-0.047}(-0.002)$	$-0.011^{+0.043}_{-0.045}(-0.012)$
Ω_m	$0.296^{+0.066}_{-0.061}(0.273)$	$0.294^{+0.049}_{-0.045}(0.295)$
$\widetilde{V}_0$	$0.02^{+0.17}_{-0.17}(0.0477)$	$-0.04^{+0.12}_{-0.13}(0.0061)$
$\widetilde{V}_1$	$0.0^{+1.9}_{-1.7}(-0.467)$	$0.41^{+0.86}_{-0.76}(0.126)$
$\widetilde{V}_2$	$-0.3^{+7.0}_{-6.9}(1.60)$	$-0.6^{+1.2}_{-1.3}(-0.364)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	551.8/(581 d.o.f.)	585.0/(616 d.o.f.)

Table 5. Summary of results for quintessence theories. Parameters are defined in (3.4), and reported errors are 95% confidence level; best fit values are shown in brackets.

Figure 2. Results for quintessence theories, see Table 5. All model parameters (3.4) are compatible with zero at 1-σ, indicating that ΛCDM is the favoured limit in this case. Nonetheless, a relevant portion of parameter space is still allowed by the data, see also section 5.3

.

studied in this paper, as explained in the previous sections, a finite expansion around $z = 0$ must be considered in order to keep our analysis as general as possible. Results in Table 4 show the existence of an excellent agreement between $z < 1$ and all–z data, with slightly smaller Ω_m in the all–z fits.

It might be instructive to see how results change if we treat ΛCDM in the same way as the other theories, namely expanding using the relations:

$$q_0 = -1 + \frac{3\Omega_m}{2}\,, \quad j_0 = 1\,, \quad s_0 = 1 - \frac{9\Omega_m}{2}\,, \tag{5.3a}$$

which describe the expansion of ΛCDM around $z = 0$. By doing so, we can test the consistency of our method and also investigate if and how constraints are affected by truncating the expansion of $H(z)$ at a finite order. In other words, comparing results for the exact ΛCDM model and for this truncated ΛCDM can help us estimate the importance of high-order corrections to the cosmographic expansion, and for which parameters we expect them to be most relevant.

Our results for the truncated ΛCDM model are shown in Table 4, where one can see how the exact and truncated models agree within 1–σ confidence level, the agreement being better for $z < 1$ data than for the all–z dataset. This is somewhat expected, since high-order terms should be more relevant at higher redshifts, where the two models are more likely to differ. Interestingly, Ω_m tends to be larger for the the exact ΛCDM model. In terms of q_0, j_0, s_0 (5.3), this translates into larger values of q_0 and smaller values of s_0. Errors are essentially the same in both cases, which indicates a negligible gain in precision when using the exact model instead of the truncated expansion. However, there seems to be a bias effect due to the finiteness of the expansion, which leads to lower values of Ω_m and in turn to a smaller q_0 and a larger s_0.

5.3 Quintessence Theories

Our results for quintessence theories are summarised in table 5 and figure 2. All model parameters $\widetilde{V}_i$ are compatible with zero within 2–σ confidence level in all cases, which supports the evidence for ΛCDM as an excellent approximation for the cosmological expansion history. On the other hand, the 1–σ and 2–σ confidence level regions allow for some deviation, with $\widetilde{V}_0$ constrained at $\sim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$, and $\widetilde{V}_1$ and $\widetilde{V}_2$ constrained at the level of $\mathcal{O}(1)$. As one can see in figure 2, the fits with $z < 1$ and for all z agree perfectly, and the contribution of $z > 1$ data is, as expected, more evident for parameters involving higher derivatives. The mean values agree within 1–σ confidence level, and in



Parameter	$z < 1$	All–z
h_0	$70.1^{+1.9}_{-1.9}(69.2)$	$69.8^{+1.8}_{-1.8}(69.2)$
Δ_M	$-0.002^{+0.047}_{-0.047}(-0.023)$	$-0.004^{+0.044}_{-0.044}(-0.020)$
$\widetilde{\Omega}_m$	$0.294^{+0.062}_{-0.058}(0.294)$	$0.294^{+0.052}_{-0.047}(0.289)$
$\widetilde{F}_2$	$0.11^{+0.28}_{-0.23}(0.029)$	$0.00^{+0.14}_{-0.13}(-0.024)$
$\widetilde{F}_3$	$-1.3^{+2.7}_{-5.4}(0.028)$	$0.18^{+0.49}_{-0.68}(0.293)$
$\widetilde{F}_4$	$42^{+200}_{-70}(-0.66)$	$-0.5^{+5.6}_{-2.7}(-1.636)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.2/(581 d.o.f.)	585.6/(616 d.o.f.)

Table 6. Results for $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories. Errors correspond to 95% confidence levels; best fit values are in brackets.

Figure 3. Results for $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories for $z < 1$ and all–z. All model parameters are nicely compatible with zero (ΛCDM limit), but $\widetilde{F}_3$ and especially $\widetilde{F}_4$ can deviate rather substantially from zero, particularly for the $z < 1$ analysis.

the full analysis the errors are reduced by a factor between 1.5 (for Ω_m) and roughly 5 (for $\widetilde{V}_2$). For definiteness, let us consider a simple model with a quadratic potential as follows

$$V(\phi(z)) \;=\; \frac{3H_0^2}{8\pi G}\Omega_z + \frac{1}{28\pi G}m_z^2(z-\zeta)^2\,, \tag{5.4}$$

where Ω_z and ζ are dimensionless constants, and m_z can be understood as the mass associated to the scalar field.[9] For this model we have

$$\widetilde{V}_0 = \frac{m_z^2\zeta^2}{2H_0^2} - 3(1-\Omega_m-\Omega_z)\;,\;\; \widetilde{V}_1 = -\frac{m_z^2\zeta}{H_0^2}\;,\;\; \widetilde{V}_2 = \frac{m_z^2}{H_0^2}\,. \tag{5.5}$$

The constraints $|\widetilde{V}_0| \lesssim 0.1$, $|\widetilde{V}_{1,2}| \lesssim 1$ provide:

$$|m_z| \lesssim H_0\,,\;\; |\zeta| \lesssim 1\,,\;\; |1-\Omega_z-\Omega_m| \lesssim 0.2\,. \tag{5.6}$$

Let us comment on these values. The mass m_z of the scalar field must be at most of the order of the present Hubble rate, which is precisely what would be expected for scalar fields responsible for the present cosmic acceleration. The constant term Ω_z is very close to $1-\Omega_m$, which would be the case for a flat ΛCDM model identifying $\Omega_z \to \Omega_\Lambda$.

5.4 $F(\mathcal{T})$ Theories

Our results for $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories are shown in Table 6 and figure 3. All model parameters are compatible with zero at about 1–σ level in the all–z analysis. Still, the 95% confidence levels allow for quite a large parameter range, particularly for higher derivatives ($\widetilde{F}_3$, $\widetilde{F}_4$). This also appears in a rather dramatic way for the $z < 1$ results, whereby $\widetilde{F}_3$ and $\widetilde{F}_4$ are only constrained at the level of $|\widetilde{F}_3| \lesssim 5$ and $|\widetilde{F}_4| \lesssim 200$. However, this is presumably merely an indication of the flatness of the χ^2 manifold for varying $\widetilde{F}_i$ for the $z < 1$ data, rather than an indication of a true departure from ΛCDM. The position of the best-fit points, very close to $\widetilde{F}_i = 0$, supports this conclusion. Interestingly, the posterior probabilities are far from Gaussian, with long tails at large positive or negative values, with

$$\widetilde{F}_{2,4} \gtrsim 0\;\;,\;\;\; \widetilde{F}_3 \;\;\lesssim 0\,. \tag{5.7}$$



Parameter	$z < 1$	All–z
h_0	$69.9^{+2.0}_{-1.9}(69.6)$	$69.6^{+1.8}_{-1.8}(69.3)$
Δ_M	$-0.006^{+0.048}_{-0.048}(-0.017)$	$-0.007^{+0.045}_{-0.045}(-0.018)$
$\widetilde{\Omega}_m$	$0.292^{+0.063}_{-0.060}(0.284)$	$0.293^{+0.053}_{-0.049}(0.292)$
$\widetilde{f}_0$	$0.4^{+3.5}_{-2.3}(4.63)$	$0.40^{+1.5}_{-0.70}(0.348)$
$\widetilde{f}_1$	$-0.1^{+1.3}_{-1.1}(-0.017)$	$0.23^{+0.55}_{-0.53}(0.300)$
$\widetilde{f}_2$	$0.7^{+4.5}_{-4.3}(1.95)$	$0.20^{+1.0}_{-0.86}(0.074)$
β	$0.0^{+3.0}_{-3.0}(-3.951)$	$0.0^{+1.8}_{-1.8}(0.711)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.1/(581 d.o.f.)	585.6/(616 d.o.f.)

Table 7. Results for $f(R)$ theories. Errors correspond to 95% confidence levels; best fit values are in brackets.

Figure 4. Results for $f(R)$ theories for $z < 1$ and all–z. The model parameters are nicely centred around zero, but departures of order unity are allowed. The odd shapes of the contours indicates that the likelihood surface differs from a multi-variate Gaussian even in the vicinity of the maximum likelihood point.

5.5 $f(R)$ Theories

Our results for these theories are shown in Table 7 and figure 4. We see that all model parameters are compatible with zero at about 1–σ level. Notably, the contours have shapes quite different from ellipses, which can be understood as an indication of the complexity of the relations between the cosmographic and model parameters, as one can see inspecting eq. (3.18). Moreover, such contours change rather drastically in shape and size from the $z < 1$ to the all–z case, although the higher-likelihood regions are still nicely overlapping. This is most probably an indication of how well $f(R)$ theories are capable of mimicking ΛCDM: unlike e.g., quintessence theories, where contours are ellipses and change relatively little from $z < 1$ to all–z except for their size, $f(R)$ theories parameters are extremely sensitive to changes in the cosmographic parameters, and in a highly non-trivial way. In other words, a small variation in the uncertainties on q_0, j_0 and s_0 might lead to a large and complex variation in the uncertainties on $f(R)$ parameters.

On the other hand, this also means that an increase in the precision in determining the cosmographic parameters might lead to a possibly significant reduction of the parameter space for $f(R)$ theories. Let us consider for instance the regions at $\widetilde{f}_0 \lesssim 0$ in figure 4. Although allowed by the $z < 1$ analysis, such a region disappears completely from the all–z fits, despite the small improvement in the determination of q_0 in the two cases (as evidenced by the very similar contours for Ω_m in the ΛCDM analysis, or $\widetilde{V}_0$ in quintessence theories).

5.6 Model Selection Criteria

We compare models using several well-known model selection criteria, namely the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), the corrected Akaike Information Criterion (AICc), and the Bayes Information Criterion (BIC), defined as (see e.g. [114]):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{AIC} &\equiv -2\ln\mathcal{L} + 2d\,, \\ \mathrm{AICc} &\equiv \mathrm{AIC} + \frac{2d(d+1)}{N-d-1}\,, \\ \mathrm{BIC} &\equiv -2\ln\mathcal{L} + d\ln N\,, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

[9]The factor $8\pi G$ in the denominator of the mass term is present for dimensional reasons: scalar fields have conventionally natural dimensions of [Energy] whereas z is dimensionless.

Model	Δd	$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	ΔAIC	ΔAICc	ΔBIC
			$z < 1$		
Exact ΛCDM	0	552.8	–	–	–
Trunc. ΛCDM	0	552.2	-0.60	-0.60	-0.60
quintessence	3	551.8	5.00	5.04	18.1
$F(\mathcal{T})$	3	552.2	5.40	5.44	18.5
$f(R)$	3	552.1	5.30	5.34	18.4
			All–z		
Exact ΛCDM	0	584.5	–	–	–
Trunc. ΛCDM	0	601.5	17.0	17.0	17.0
quintessence	3	585.0	6.50	6.54	19.8
$F(\mathcal{T})$	3	585.6	7.10	7.14	20.4
$f(R)$	3	585.6	7.10	7.14	20.4

Table 8. Model selection criteria. Modified gravity theories are strongly disfavoured compared the exact ΛCDM model, but are actually favoured to the truncated ΛCDM model if one follows the AIC(c). Unsurprisingly, modified gravity is still disfavoured despite the lower $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ according to the BIC, due to the presence of extra parameters.

where d is the number of parameters of the model, and N is the number of data points.

These quantities contain possibly large scaling constants, due especially to the largeness of the number of data points considered. However, the differences

$$\Delta X = X_{\rm model} - X_{\Lambda\rm CDM}\,, \quad X = \mathrm{AIC}, \mathrm{AICc}, \mathrm{BIC} \tag{5.9}$$

are independent of these scaling, and are a measure of the information loss experienced when fitting using a model instead of the reference model, that is exact ΛCDM. As general rule of thumb, one usually considers $\Delta \leq 2$ to indicate substantial support (evidence), $4 \leq \Delta \leq 7$ much less support, and $\Delta \geq 10$ essentially no support.

The results of our analysis are shown in Table 8. The truncated ΛCDM model contains no additional parameters with respect to the exact model, with h_0, Δ_M and Ω_m being the only parameters upon which all observables depend. In particular, the cosmographic parameters q_0, j_0 and s_0 are fixed once we choose Ω_m.

On the other hand, quintessence, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories all have three extra parameters. In fact, the independent combinations of parameters in all these three theories turn out to be q_0, j_0 and s_0, regardless of the considered theory. None of these three quantities can be derived simply from Ω_m as in the ΛCDM models, as discussed above.

Concerning the truncation, we should make the following comments:

- For $z < 1$ data, the truncated-ΛCDM model is actually slightly preferred to the exact model, with almost identical $\chi^2_{\rm min}$, whereas the other models are very weakly supported (ΔAIC ~ 5). The ΔBIC takes on very large values, due to the much higher penalty attributed by this criterion to extra parameters.

- For all–z data, the situation is more complicated. The exact ΛCDM model is strongly preferred compared to the truncated model, whereas the other models have essentially the same $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ as the exact (best) model, which results in very little support in their favour because of the presence of extra parameters. However, there is very strong support for each of the models considered when compared to the truncated ΛCDM model, with $\Delta\mathrm{AIC} \lesssim -10$, but still no support using the BIC, $\Delta\mathrm{BIC} \sim 9$.

Parameter	$z < 1$	All–z
	$\boldsymbol{F(\mathcal{T})}$, $\boldsymbol{F_2 = 0}$	
h_0	$69.6^{+1.5}_{-1.6}(69.4)$	$69.8^{+1.4}_{-1.4}(69.5)$
Δ_M	$-0.011^{+0.043}_{-0.044}(-0.017)$	$-0.004^{+0.039}_{-0.039}(-0.013)$
Ω_m	$0.296^{+0.069}_{-0.063}(0.282)$	$0.295^{+0.051}_{-0.045}(0.297)$
$\widetilde{F}_3$	$0.2^{+1.1}_{-1.2}(-0.01)$	$0.23^{+0.31}_{-0.33}(0.225)$
$\widetilde{F}_4$	$1.2^{+18}_{-9.4}(0.726)$	$-1.2^{+2.4}_{-1.7}(-1.38)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.4/(581 d.o.f.)	585.7/(616 d.o.f.)
	$\boldsymbol{f(R)}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta = 0}$	
h_0	$69.7^{+2.1}_{-1.9}(69.7)$	$69.6^{+1.8}_{-1.8}(69.4)$
Δ_M	$-0.009^{+0.050}_{-0.048}(-0.019)$	$-0.008^{+0.045}_{-0.045}(-0.012)$
Ω_m	$0.297^{+0.068}_{-0.063}(0.284)$	$0.294^{+0.051}_{-0.047}(0.288)$
$\widetilde{f}_0$	$0.02^{+0.17}_{-0.17}(0.046)$	$-0.02^{+0.12}_{-0.12}(-0.023)$
$\widetilde{f}_1$	$0.1^{+1.5}_{-1.4}(-0.256)$	$0.26^{+0.59}_{-0.52}(0.234)$
$\widetilde{f}_2$	$-0.2^{+5.0}_{-4.5}(0.857)$	$-0.11^{+0.60}_{-0.58}(-0.072)$
$\chi^2_{\rm min}$	552.1/(581 d.o.f.)	585.6/(616 d.o.f.)

Table 9. Summary of results for $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories, for $(F_1, F_2) = (1, 0)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ respectively.

On the one hand, all theories under consideration in this paper should of course be compared to the Concordance model (the exact ΛCDM model), and when doing so all of them appear to be strongly disfavoured. On the other hand, in making this comparison, we limit ourselves to a finite expansion order for the three theories, but not for ΛCDM. If, instead, we use a finite expansion for the Concordance model as well, i.e., the truncated ΛCDM model, these alternative theories considered enjoy much stronger support, at least when using the AIC and AICc. In other words, it seems that if we did not know that ΛCDM is exactly solvable and only expanded it up to third order around $z = 0$, as we do for the other models, we would actually find strong support for these alternative theories of gravity.

We stress that we should not take this result too literally and interpret it as "Bayesian evidence" for modified gravity. As discussed in 2.3, we are using a finite order expansion but using data at $z > 1$, hence statistical biases very likely plays a considerable role. The apparent "rejection" of the truncated ΛCDM is likely an artifact of these approximations and will definitely disappear at higher orders, because we found that the exact ΛCDM model is by far the preferred one.

When using a truncated expansion of a model to given order, we are essentially fixing all higher derivatives of the Hubble rate to zero. For ΛCDM, where derivatives of H depend only on Ω_m, this implies a very tight relation between $q, j, s, \ldots$, which are not allowed to vary *independently*. In turn, this leads to a relatively poor fit of cosmological data. For modified theories, the additional parameters result in greater freedom in the relative dependence of $q, j, s, \ldots$ and in an overall better fit.

All in all, we can interpret our results as follows. We know that ΛCDM works extremely well for the complete cosmological expansion history, and particularly so at late times. Therefore, any alternative theory will have to mimic ΛCDM rather precisely if it is to be compatible with cosmological data. In turn, we do not expect a significant improvement in terms of $\chi^2_{\rm min}$ when considering alternative theories. It is because these theories contain extra parameters that they will in general be disfavoured, very strongly in fact, in the case of the BIC which heavily penalises additional parameters.

5.7 Comparison with Previous Work

The typical approach, commonly adopted in the literature when dealing with $f(R)$ and $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories, is to assume that $\alpha = 1$ [21] and $F_1 = 1$ [22] respectively. The consequence of these choices is that



Figure 5. Results for $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories assuming $F_2 = 0$, compared with the general results, for $z < 1$ (left) and all–z (right). See Table 9. There are noticeable differences in the results for both $\widetilde{F}_3$ and $\widetilde{F}_4$, with the errors being underestimated in the $F_2 = 0$ case.



Figure 6. Results for $f(R)$ theories assuming $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$, for $z < 1$ (left) and all–z (right), compared with the general results. See Table 9. Imposing $\beta = 0$ has little effect on the bounds for $\widetilde{f}_1$ and $\widetilde{f}_2$, but the bounds $\widetilde{f}_0$ are substantially modified.

the cosmological value of Newton's constant is fixed to its Solar system value and naively extended to cosmological scales [22]. Moreover, another hypothesis is to assume that the current values of the second derivative of f and F are negligibly small at $R = R_0$ and $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_0$, i.e., β and F_2 very close to zero respectively. This guarantees that the limiting cases of $f(R)$ and $F(\mathcal{T})$ reduce to the ΛCDM model in intermediate redshift domains. These choices on both the first and the second derivatives on the $f(R)$ and $F(\mathcal{T})$ gravitational Lagrangians today are very strict since they limit the extensions of GR to have a cosmological constant as limiting case. Hence, although reasonable, these assumptions are not at all general. As a byproduct, the dark energy reconstruction is based on modeling the discrepancies with data by smoothing different functions under very tight assumptions and consequently the danger is to obtain *model dependent* reconstructed cosmological models. Therefore, the *inverse procedure* of obtaining potential candidates of $f(R)$ and $F(\mathcal{T})$ from cosmography may be misleading.

The comparison between our approach and the usual approximations are shown in Figs. 5 and 6 and Table 9. In particular, we find that:

- For $F(\mathcal{T})$ gravity, setting $F_2 = 0$ has a very significant effect on both $\widetilde{F}_3$ and $\widetilde{F}_4$, whose 95% errors are reduced by at least about a factor 3 (for $\widetilde{F}_3$, all–z) up to 3 orders of magnitude ($\widetilde{F}_4$, $z < 1$).

- in the case of $f(R)$ theories, setting $\beta = 0$, as done in Ref. [22], affects mainly the bounds on $\widetilde{f}_0$, while $\widetilde{f}_1$ and $\widetilde{f}_2$ have essentially the same posterior distributions as in the $\beta \neq 0$ case. Errors of $\widetilde{f}_0$ are about a factor 10 larger if we relax the assumption $\beta = 0$. Results in [23] provided a first insight about the intrinsic limitations of cosmography when dealing with $f(R)$ theories showing how naive priors on f_R and f_{RR} as those in Ref. [21] were very limited. Ref. [23] also showed that the cosmographic approach is unable to find the specific $f(R)$ model even when mock luminosity distance data are generated with a viable (Hu-Sawicki) $f(R)$ model cosmology. In other words, the cosmographic technique was proved unable to adequately constrain the $f(R)$ parameters responsible for a cosmological evolution when only mock luminosity distance data are used.

Thus, our results show unequivocally that the assumptions made in the literature when discussing constraints on $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories from cosmography are in general wrong, and result in excessively strong bounds on the viability or parameter space of theories. In particular, we have shown that the usual assumption that $F_1 = \alpha = 1$ is completely superfluous, because both parameters can be eliminated with a suitable rescaling of the other parameters. Moreover, the assumptions $\widetilde{F}_2 = \beta = 0$ strongly affect the posterior probabilities of the other model parameters, in such a way that error bars are grossly underestimated. Our analysis shows that a much larger portion of parameters space of these theories is actually allowed by cosmographic tests.

On the one hand, this is an indication of the general ability of these theories to mimic ΛCDM, especially at low redshift. On the other hand, it shows the limitations of the cosmographic approach in effectively constraining modified gravity theories.

As a complementary comment the results we have obtained in the previous sections show that the Gaussian process technique when applied to quintessence theories (see [25] and citations of that reference) remains more competitive than the cosmographic approach, even when other cosmological probes (BAO and $H(z)$) are combined with SNIa data. Finally, let us mention that Refs. [21–24] only dealt with SNIa data whereas our present analysis has included both Union 2.1 supernovae catalogue, baryonic acoustic oscillation data and $H(z)$ differential age compilations, which indeed probe cosmology on different scales of the cosmological evolution. In this sense also, our analysis overcome previous attempts to prove the validity and competitiveness of the cosmographic approach.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have extended previous cosmographic analyses to three classes of competing modified theories of gravity. In particular, we have considered quintessence, $F(\mathcal{T})$ and $f(R)$ theories. We have tested these theories using cosmography without assuming any limitations on the parameter space for each of these gravitational theories. In doing so, we avoided the common treatment developed by the majority of previous authors, who were either unable to capture essential trends in the theories under consideration or underestimated the cosmographic bounds. In particular, by virtue of the fact that cosmography is a completely model-independent method based on the cosmological principle only, we derived constraints on the cosmographic series which do not depend essentially on any specific modifications of General Relativity. This allows one to put bounds on the cosmic coefficients of any theory without postulating the underlying model *a priori*. We were therefore able to fit these theories using three different catalogues: Union 2.1 type Ia supernovae, BAO and $H(z)$ measures, with the support of the most recent Planck data. We employed the use of flat priors on all parameters with the exception of $r_s(z_{\rm drag})$, in which a Gaussian prior was used, set at Planck's best values.

We first used data in the very small redshift regime $z < 1$, using 22 and 551 data points for $H(z)$ and SNIa respectively. We then performed the same analyses but with all data points for every dataset, i.e., without limiting them to $z < 1$. In this way, we were able to check the consistency of

using finite Taylor expansions. This does not apply to BAO measurements, since all data points are confined inside $z < 1$. Hence, the same data were used for both fits.

With these considerations in mind, we performed MCMC simulations using a Metropolis-Hastings algorithm and a Gelman-Rubin convergence diagnostics. We then performed the statistical analysis of the produced chains using publicly available `Python` codes.

As a standard way out of comparing our approaches with data, we first presented the ΛCDM results, in which the only free parameter turns out to be the total non-relativistic matter density parameter Ω_m, as Ω_k is set to zero. We obtained excellent agreement between the $z < 1$ and all–z datasets, as slightly smaller Ω_m have been taken into account in our fits. We therefore investigated ways in which our constraints are affected by truncating the expansion of $H(z)$ at finite orders, by comparing results for the exact ΛCDM model and for the corresponding truncated series. We found the exact and truncated models agree within 1–σ level, with an almost perfect overlap between the two cases for $z < 1$.

The main results for every class of extended theories can be summarised as follows:

- For quintessence: all derivatives of the potential are compatible with zero inside the 2–σ confidence levels, demonstrating that the Concordance model works perfectly well, while still allowing for some slight deviations, i.e., $\widetilde{V}_0 \in \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ and $\widetilde{V}_1$ and $\widetilde{V}_2$ constrained at the level of $\mathcal{O}(1)$. The inclusion of the data at larger z ($z > 1$), as expected, results in a reduction of the errors on parameters, particularly for higher derivative terms.

- For $F(\mathcal{T})$ theories we again found that all model parameters are compatible with zero at about the 1–σ level, while the 2–σ level enables for quite larger parameter ranges, especially for higher derivatives, i.e., $\widetilde{F}_3$, $\widetilde{F}_4$. In fact, $\widetilde{F}_3$ and $\widetilde{F}_4$ are only constrained at the level of $\mathcal{O}(10^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}(10^2)$ levels for $z < 1$ data, and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ and (10) for the full dataset. The best-fit points are still relatively close to $\widetilde{F}_i = 0$, but the posterior probabilities are far from Gaussian, with long tails which extend to either positive or negative values.

- For $f(R)$ theories, we found that all model parameters were compatible with zero at about the 1–σ level, albeit the shapes of contour plots being different from pure ellipses. Indeed, such shape also changes as one moves from the $z < 1$ analysis to the all–z analysis.

In all the theories considered, we have also compared our statistical results to the widely used AIC and BIC criteria. We found that, expanding the standard cosmological model till the third order, the corresponding third orders of any modified theories studied here seem to be statistically favoured by using the AIC criteria, however disfavoured in the case of BIC.

Finally we compared our treatment, which was solely based on the most general assumptions, to previous approaches, noticing a discrepancy in the results. Thus we showed the undesirable model-dependence which existed in the previous literature for several classes of reconstructed extended dark-energy theories.

Future work will take higher-redshift catalogues into account in order to fully characterise the cosmographic approach established here, with different windows of data points. This will be helpful in determining the effective dark energy evolution, as obtained from several classes of modified theories of gravity, in different cosmological eras.

Acknowledgments

A.d.l.C.D. acknowledges financial support from the University of Cape Town (UCT) Launching Grants programme, National Research Foundation (NRF) grant 99077 2016-2018, ref. No. CSUR150628121624, MINECO (Spain) projects FIS2014-52837-P, FPA2014-53375-C2-1-P, Consolider-Ingenio MULTIDARK CSD2009-00064 and CSIC I-LINK1019 and would also like to thank the Instittuto de Física Teórica (IFT UAM-CSIC, Madrid Spain) for its support via the KA107 action of the Erasmus+ Call for international Mobility and the EU COST Action CA15117. P. K. S. D. and L. R. thank the National Research Foundation (NRF) for financial support.

References

[1] Supernova Search Team collaboration, A. G. Riess et al., *Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant*, *Astron.J.* **116** (1998) 1009–1038, [astro-ph/9805201].

[2] Supernova Cosmology Project collaboration, S. Perlmutter et al., *Discovery of a supernova explosion at half the age of the Universe and its cosmological implications*, *Nature* **391** (1998) 51–54, [astro-ph/9712212].

[3] Supernova Search Team collaboration, B. P. Schmidt et al., *The High Z supernova search: Measuring cosmic deceleration and global curvature of the universe using type Ia supernovae*, *Astrophys.J.* **507** (1998) 46–63, [astro-ph/9805200].

[4] Supernova Cosmology Project collaboration, S. Perlmutter et al., *Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high redshift supernovae*, *Astrophys.J.* **517** (1999) 565–586, [astro-ph/9812133].

[5] Supernova Search Team collaboration, A. G. Riess et al., *Type Ia supernova discoveries at $z > 1$ from the Hubble Space Telescope: Evidence for past deceleration and constraints on dark energy evolution*, *Astrophys.J.* **607** (2004) 665–687, [astro-ph/0402512].

[6] Virgo, LIGO Scientific collaboration, B. P. Abbott et al., *Observation of Gravitational Waves from a Binary Black Hole Merger*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016) 061102, [1602.03837].

[7] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Dark energy cosmology: the equivalent description via different theoretical models and cosmography tests*, *Astrophys. Space Sci.* **342** (2012) 155–228, [1205.3421].

[8] P. J. E. Peebles and B. Ratra, *The Cosmological constant and dark energy*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75** (2003) 559–606, [astro-ph/0207347].

[9] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *Extended Theories of Gravity*, *Phys.Rept.* **509** (2011) 167–321, [1108.6266].

[10] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, *f(R) Theories Of Gravity*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** (2010) 451–497, [0805.1726].

[11] C. Rubano and P. Scudellaro, *Quintessence or phoenix?*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **34** (2002) 1931–1939, [astro-ph/0203225].

[12] L. Amendola, M. Kunz, M. Motta, I. D. Saltas and I. Sawicki, *Observables and unobservables in dark energy cosmologies*, *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 023501, [1210.0439].

[13] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, *Towards degeneracy problem breaking by large scale structures methods*, *Progress in Mathematical Relativity, Gravitation and Cosmology* (2014) 243–247, [1302.6111].

[14] O. Luongo, G. B. Pisani and A. Troisi, *Cosmological degeneracy versus cosmography: a cosmographic dark energy model*, 1512.07076.

[15] S. Weinberg, *Gravitation and Cosmology*. John Wiley and Sons, 1972.

[16] M. Visser, *General relativistic energy conditions: The Hubble expansion in the epoch of galaxy formation*, *Phys. Rev.* **D56** (1997) 7578–7587, [gr-qc/9705070].

[17] E. Harrison, *Observational tests in cosmology*, *Nature* **260** (1976) 591–592.

[18] M. Visser, *Cosmography: Cosmology without the Einstein equations*, *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **37** (2005) 1541–1548, [gr-qc/0411131].

[19] M. Visser, *Conformally Friedmann-Lemaître-Robertson-Walker cosmologies*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **32** (2015) 135007, [1502.02758].

[20] O. Luongo, *Dark energy from a positive jerk parameter*, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A28** (2013) 1350080.

[21] A. Aviles, A. Bravetti, S. Capozziello and O. Luongo, *Updated constraints on f(R) gravity from cosmography*, *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 044012, [1210.5149].

[22] A. Aviles, A. Bravetti, S. Capozziello and O. Luongo, *Cosmographic reconstruction of $f(\mathcal{T})$ cosmology*, *Phys. Rev.* **D87** (2013) 064025, [1302.4871].

[23] V. C. Busti, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P. K. S. Dunsby and D. Saéz-Gómez, *Is cosmography a useful tool for testing cosmology?*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 123512, [1505.05503].

[24] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, *Limitations of cosmography in extended theories of gravity*, *To appear in Proceedings of Science DSU 2015 Kyoto (Japan)* (2016) , [1604.07355].

[25] R. Nair, S. Jhingan and D. Jain, *Exploring scalar field dynamics with Gaussian processes*, *JCAP* **1401** (2014) 005, [1306.0606].

[26] F. W. Hehl, P. Von Der Heyde, G. D. Kerlick and J. M. Nester, *General Relativity with Spin and Torsion: Foundations and Prospects*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **48** (1976) 393–416.

[27] K. Hayashi and T. Shirafuji, *New General Relativity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D19** (1979) 3524–3553.

[28] F. Wilczek, *Riemann-Einstein structure from volume and gauge symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 4851–4854, [hep-th/9801184].

[29] Yu. n. Obukhov, *SPECTRAL GEOMETRY OF THE RIEMANN-CARTAN SPACE-TIME*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B212** (1983) 237–254.

[30] I. M. Benn, T. Dereli and R. W. Tucker, *Gauge Field Interactions in Spaces With Arbitrary Torsion*, *Phys. Lett.* **B96** (1980) 100.

[31] R. Aldrovandi and J. G. Pereira, *Teleparallel Gravity*, vol. 173 of *Fundamental Theories of Physics*. Springer, Dordrecht, 2013, 10.1007/978-94-007-5143-9.

[32] G. R. Bengochea and R. Ferraro, *Dark torsion as the cosmic speed-up*, *Phys. Rev.* **D79** (2009) 124019, [0812.1205].

[33] K. Bamba, S. Capozziello, M. De Laurentis, S. Nojiri and D. Sáez-Gómez, *No further gravitational wave modes in $F(T)$ gravity*, *Phys. Lett.* **B727** (2013) 194–198, [1309.2698].

[34] B. Li, T. P. Sotiriou and J. D. Barrow, *$f(T)$ gravity and local Lorentz invariance*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 064035, [1010.1041].

[35] T. P. Sotiriou, B. Li and J. D. Barrow, *Generalizations of teleparallel gravity and local Lorentz symmetry*, *Phys. Rev.* **D83** (2011) 104030, [1012.4039].

[36] Y. C. Ong, K. Izumi, J. M. Nester and P. Chen, *Problems with Propagation and Time Evolution in f(T) Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013) 024019, [1303.0993].

[37] K. Izumi, J.-A. Gu and Y. C. Ong, *Acausality and Nonunique Evolution in Generalized Teleparallel Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 084025, [1309.6461].

[38] P. Chen, K. Izumi, J. M. Nester and Y. C. Ong, *Remnant Symmetry, Propagation and Evolution in $f(T)$ Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 064003, [1412.8383].

[39] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *Non trivial frames for f(T) theories of gravity and beyond*, *Phys. Lett.* **B702** (2011) 75–80, [1103.0824].

[40] C. G. Boehmer, T. Harko and F. S. N. Lobo, *Wormhole geometries in modified teleparralel gravity and the energy conditions*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 044033, [1110.5756].

[41] X.-h. Meng and Y.-b. Wang, *Birkhoff's theorem in the f(T) gravity*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C71** (2011) 1755, [1107.0629].

[42] H. Dong, Y.-b. Wang and X.-h. Meng, *Extended Birkhoff's Theorem in the f(T) Gravity*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C72** (2012) 2002, [1203.5890].

[43] L. Iorio and E. N. Saridakis, *Solar system constraints on f(T) gravity*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **427** (2012) 1555, [1203.5781].

[44] T. Wang, *Static Solutions with Spherical Symmetry in f(T) Theories*, *Phys. Rev.* **D84** (2011) 024042, [1102.4410].

[45] M. Hamani Daouda, M. E. Rodrigues and M. J. S. Houndjo, *New Static Solutions in f(T) Theory*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C71** (2011) 1817, [1108.2920].

[46] M. Hamani Daouda, M. E. Rodrigues and M. J. S. Houndjo, *Static Anisotropic Solutions in f(T) Theory*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C72** (2012) 1890, [1109.0528].

[47] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *Spherically symmetric static spacetimes in vacuum f(T) gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D84** (2011) 083518, [1109.4209].

[48] N. Tamanini and C. G. Boehmer, *Good and bad tetrads in f(T) gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 044009, [1204.4593].

[49] C. G. Boehmer, A. Mussa and N. Tamanini, *Existence of relativistic stars in f(T) gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **28** (2011) 245020, [1107.4455].

[50] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P. K. S. Dunsby and D. Saez-Gomez, *Junction conditions in extended Teleparallel gravities*, *JCAP* **1412** (2014) 048, [1406.2334].

[51] S. Capozziello, O. Luongo and E. N. Saridakis, *Transition redshift in $f(T)$ cosmology and observational constraints*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 124037, [1503.02832].

[52] V. T. Gurovich and A. A. Starobinsky, *QUANTUM EFFECTS AND REGULAR COSMOLOGICAL MODELS*, *Sov.Phys.JETP* **50** (1979) 844–852.

[53] A. A. Starobinsky, *Relict Gravitation Radiation Spectrum and Initial State of the Universe. (In Russian)*, *JETP Lett.* **30** (1979) 682–685.

[54] A. A. Starobinsky, *A New Type of Isotropic Cosmological Models Without Singularity*, *Phys.Lett.* **B91** (1980) 99–102.

[55] R. P. Woodard, *Avoiding dark energy with $1/r$ modifications of gravity*, *Lect. Notes Phys.* **720** (2007) 403–433, [astro-ph/0601672].

[56] T. Biswas, E. Gerwick, T. Koivisto and A. Mazumdar, *Towards singularity and ghost free theories of gravity*, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **108** (2012) 031101, [1110.5249].

[57] N. Birrell and P. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982.

[58] I. Buchbinder, S. Odintsov and I. Shapiro, *Effective Action in Quantum Gravity*. IOP Publishing, Bristol, 1992.

[59] G. Vilkovisky, *Effective action in quantum gravity*, *Class.Quant.Grav.* **9** (1992) 895–903.

[60] S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Unified cosmic history in modified gravity: from F(R) theory to Lorentz non-invariant models*, *Phys. Rept.* **505** (2011) 59–144, [1011.0544].

[61] A. Joyce, B. Jain, J. Khoury and M. Trodden, *Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model*, *Phys. Rept.* **568** (2015) 1–98, [1407.0059].

[62] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, *f(R) theories*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **13** (2010) 3, [1002.4928].

[63] F. S. N. Lobo, *The Dark side of gravity: Modified theories of gravity*, 0807.1640.

[64] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz and D. Saez-Gomez, *Black holes, cosmological solutions, future singularities, and their thermodynamical properties in modified gravity theories*, *Entropy* **14** (2012) 1717–1770, [1207.2663].

[65] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla and C. Skordis, *Modified Gravity and Cosmology*, *Phys. Rept.* **513** (2012) 1–189, [1106.2476].

[66] S. Ferrara, A. Kehagias and A. Riotto, *The Imaginary Starobinsky Model*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **62** (2014) 573–583, [1403.5531].

[67] L. Sebastiani, G. Cognola, R. Myrzakulov, S. D. Odintsov and S. Zerbini, *Nearly Starobinsky inflation from modified gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014) 023518, [1311.0744].

[68] K. Bamba, R. Myrzakulov, S. D. Odintsov and L. Sebastiani, *Trace-anomaly driven inflation in modified gravity and the BICEP2 result*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 043505, [1403.6649].

[69] E. J. Copeland, C. Rahmede and I. D. Saltas, *Asymptotically Safe Starobinsky Inflation*, *Phys. Rev.* **D91** (2015) 103530, [1311.0881].

[70] K. Bamba, S. Nojiri and S. D. Odintsov, *Reconstruction of scalar field theories realizing inflation consistent with the Planck and BICEP2 results*, *Phys. Lett.* **B737** (2014) 374–378, [1406.2417].

[71] K. Bamba, S. Nojiri, S. D. Odintsov and D. Sáez-Gómez, *Inflationary universe from perfect fluid and $F(R)$ gravity and its comparison with observational data*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 124061, [1410.3993].

[72] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, E. Elizalde, S. D. Odintsov and D. Saez-Gomez, *Spotting deviations from R^2 inflation*, 1603.05537.

[73] J. A. R. Cembranos, *Dark Matter from R2-gravity*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102** (2009) 141301, [0809.1653].

[74] S. Capozziello and M. De Laurentis, *The dark matter problem from f(R) gravity viewpoint*, *Annalen Phys.* **524** (2012) 545–578.

[75] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, A. Dobado and A. L. Maroto, *On the evolution of density perturbations in f(R) theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 123515, [0802.2999].

[76] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, A. Dobado and A. L. Maroto, *Comment on 'Viable singularity-free f(R) gravity without a cosmological constant' [arXiv:0905.1941]*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103** (2009) 179001, [0910.1441].

[77] A. Abebe, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz and P. K. S. Dunsby, *Large Scale Structure Constraints for a Class of f(R) Theories of Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D88** (2013) 044050, [1304.3462].

[78] A. Abebe, M. Abdelwahab, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz and P. K. S. Dunsby, *Covariant gauge-invariant perturbations in multifluid f(R) gravity*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **29** (2012) 135011, [1110.1191].

[79] F. D. Albareti, J. A. R. Cembranos, A. de la Cruz-Dombriz and A. Dobado, *On the non-attractive character of gravity in f(R) theories*, *JCAP* **1307** (2013) 009, [1212.4781].

[80] B. Jain, V. Vikram and J. Sakstein, *Astrophysical Tests of Modified Gravity: Constraints from Distance Indicators in the Nearby Universe*, *Astrophys. J.* **779** (2013) 39, [1204.6044].

[81] L. Lombriser, A. Slosar, U. Seljak and W. Hu, *Constraints on f(R) gravity from probing the large-scale structure*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 124038, [1003.3009].

[82] L. Lombriser, F. Schmidt, T. Baldauf, R. Mandelbaum, U. Seljak and R. E. Smith, *Cluster Density Profiles as a Test of Modified Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D85** (2012) 102001, [1111.2020].

[83] Y.-S. Song, H. Peiris and W. Hu, *Cosmological Constraints on f(R) Acceleration Models*, *Phys. Rev.* **D76** (2007) 063517, [0706.2399].

[84] Y.-S. Song, W. Hu and I. Sawicki, *The Large Scale Structure of f(R) Gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 044004, [astro-ph/0610532].

[85] A. de la Cruz-Dombriz, P. K. S. Dunsby, S. Kandhai and D. Sáez-Gómez, *Theoretical and observational constraints of viable f(R) theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016) 084016, [1511.00102].

[86] S. Kandhai and P. K. S. Dunsby, *Cosmological dynamics of viable f(R) theories of gravity*, 1511.00101.

[87] S. Capozziello, O. Farooq, O. Luongo and B. Ratra, *Cosmographic bounds on the cosmological deceleration-acceleration transition redshift in $f(\mathfrak{R})$ gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D90** (2014) 044016, [1403.1421].

[88] L. Pogosian and A. Silvestri, *The pattern of growth in viable f(R) cosmologies*, *Phys. Rev.* **D77** (2008) 023503, [0709.0296].

[89] P. K. S. Dunsby and O. Luongo, *On the theory and applications of modern cosmography*, 1511.06532.

[90] C. Cattoen and M. Visser, *The Hubble series: Convergence properties and redshift variables*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **24** (2007) 5985–5998, [0710.1887].

[91] E. Bellini and M. Zumalacarregui, *Nonlinear evolution of the baryon acoustic oscillation scale in alternative theories of gravity*, *Phys. Rev.* **D92** (2015) 063522, [1505.03839].

[92] N. Metropolis, A. W. Rosenbluth, M. N. Rosenbluth, A. H. Teller and E. Teller, *Equation of state calculations by fast computing machines*, *J. Chem. Phys.* **21** (1953) 1087–1092.

[93] H. Haario, E. Saksman and J. Tamminen, *Adaptive proposal distribution for random walk metropolis algorithm*, *Comput. Stat.* **14** (1999) 375.

[94] S. Brooks, A. Gelman, G. Jones and X.-L. Meng, *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo*. CRC press, 2011.

[95] R. Amanullah et al., *Spectra and Light Curves of Six Type Ia Supernovae at 0.511 < z < 1.12 and the Union2 Compilation*, *Astrophys. J.* **716** (2010) 712–738, [1004.1711].

[96] F. Beutler, C. Blake, M. Colless, D. H. Jones, L. Staveley-Smith et al., *The 6dF Galaxy Survey: Baryon Acoustic Oscillations and the Local Hubble Constant*, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **416** (2011) 3017–3032, [1106.3366].

[97] A. J. Ross, L. Samushia, C. Howlett, W. J. Percival, A. Burden and M. Manera, *The clustering of the SDSS DR7 main Galaxy sample – I. A 4 per cent distance measure at z = 0.15*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **449** (2015) 835–847, [1409.3242].

[98] BOSS collaboration, L. Anderson et al., *The clustering of galaxies in the SDSS-III Baryon Oscillation Spectroscopic Survey: baryon acoustic oscillations in the Data Releases 10 and 11 Galaxy samples*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **441** (2014) 24–62, [1312.4877].

[99] N. Padmanabhan, X. Xu, D. J. Eisenstein, R. Scalzo, A. J. Cuesta et al., *A 2 per cent distance to z=0.35 by reconstructing baryon acoustic oscillations - I. Methods and application to the Sloan Digital Sky Survey*, *Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc.* **427** (2012) 2132–2145, [1202.0090].

[100] O. Farooq and B. Ratra, *Constraints on dark energy from the Lyα forest baryon acoustic oscillations measurement of the redshift 2.3 Hubble parameter*, *Phys. Lett.* **B723** (2013) 1–6, [1212.4264].

[101] O. Farooq and B. Ratra, *Hubble parameter measurement constraints on the cosmological deceleration-acceleration transition redshift*, *Astrophys. J.* **766** (2013) L7, [1301.5243].

[102] A. Aviles, C. Gruber, O. Luongo and H. Quevedo, *Cosmography and constraints on the equation of state of the Universe in various parametrizations*, *Phys. Rev.* **D86** (2012) 123516, [1204.2007].

[103] Y. Fujii, *Origin of the Gravitational Constant and Particle Masses in Scale Invariant Scalar - Tensor Theory*, *Phys.Rev.* **D26** (1982) 2580.

[104] B. Ratra and P. Peebles, *Cosmological Consequences of a Rolling Homogeneous Scalar Field*, *Phys.Rev.* **D37** (1988) 3406.

[105] R. Caldwell, R. Dave and P. J. Steinhardt, *Cosmological imprint of an energy component with general equation of state*, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **80** (1998) 1582–1585, [astro-ph/9708069].

[106] C. Wetterich, *Cosmology and the Fate of Dilatation Symmetry*, *Nucl.Phys.* **B302** (1988) 668.

[107] R. Ferraro and F. Fiorini, *Modified teleparallel gravity: Inflation without inflaton*, *Phys. Rev.* **D75** (2007) 084031, [gr-qc/0610067].

[108] E. V. Linder, *Einstein's Other Gravity and the Acceleration of the Universe*, *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 127301, [1005.3039].

[109] R. Myrzakulov, *Accelerating universe from F(T) gravity*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C71** (2011) 1752, [1006.1120].

[110] N. Suzuki et al., *The Hubble Space Telescope Cluster Supernova Survey: V. Improving the Dark Energy Constraints Above z>1 and Building an Early-Type-Hosted Supernova Sample*, *Astrophys. J.* **746** (2012) 85, [1105.3470].

[111] C. Blake et al., *The WiggleZ Dark Energy Survey: Joint measurements of the expansion and growth history at z < 1*, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **425** (2012) 405–414, [1204.3674].

[112] SDSS collaboration, D. J. Eisenstein et al., *Detection of the baryon acoustic peak in the large-scale correlation function of SDSS luminous red galaxies*, *Astrophys. J.* **633** (2005) 560–574, [astro-ph/0501171].

[113] Planck collaboration, P. A. R. Ade et al., *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, 1502.01589.

[114] K. P. Burnham and D. R. Anderson, *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach*. Springer, New York, 2002.